DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 482 CS 214 641

AUTHOR	Batchelder, Susan, Ed.
TITLE	Diversity and Writing; Dialogue within a Modern University. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing (1st, Minneapolis, Minnesota, April 16-19, 1990). Monograph Series No. 2.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing.
REPORT NO	ISBN-1-881221-001-6
PUB DATE	92
NOTE	46p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing, University of Minnesota, 227 Lind Hall, 207 Church St., S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455 ($6.50).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cultural Context; *Diversity (Institutional); Ethnicity; Females; Higher Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; *Race; *Sex Differences; *Social Class; Writing (Composition); *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS	*University of Minnesota; Writing Contexts

ABSTRACT

This monograph is a report of the first annual conference sponsored by the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing at the University of Minnesota. Both the conference and the monograph support the University's goal of fostering diversity within its academic community and also focus on one of the Center's goals: exploring the effects of ethnicity, race, class and gender on writing. The monograph relates that each year the Center invites faculty members to propose projects, workshops and topics in the following areas: characteristics of writing across the curriculum; status reports on students' writing ability; the connections between writing and learning in all fields; the characteristics of writing beyond the academy; and curricular reform through writing. The manuscript to this year's keynote address, "Looking from the Margins: A Tale of Curricular Reform," by Jacqueline Jones Royster, is included in the monograph. The monograph also contains faculty responses to the address, from Lisa Albrecht, Biman Basu, Rose Brewer, Lillian Bridwell-Bowles, Dolores Cross, and Carol Miller. Their edited comments constitute part two of the monograph. Part three consists of excerpts from the question and answer session. (TB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 377 482

CS

Diversity and Writing: Dialogue within a Modern University

Proceedings
First Annual Conference
April 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Bridwell-Bowles

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CENTER FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES OF WRITING

MONOGRAPH SERIES • NO. 2 • 1992
LILLIAN BRIDWELL-BOWLES, SERIES EDITOR

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

CS214641

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Titles available in the
Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing
Monograph Series:

•Number 1. *Writing Style Differences in Newspaper, Radio, and Television News* by Irving Fang.

•Number 2. *Diversity and Writing: Dialogue within a Modern University*, Proceedings, First Annual Conference, 1990, Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing.

•Number 3. *Writing in the Design Disciplines* by Roger Martin with Paul Damon and Jean Spraker.

•Number 4. *Abstracts of Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing Grants: Completed Projects and Works in Progress.*

Forthcoming:

•*The Nature of Student Writing at the University of Minnesota in Selected Program Units* by Harlan Hansen.

•*Points of Overlap: Minority Achievement Issues and Composition Theory and Practice at the University of Minnesota* by Carol Miller.

•*Politics and Literacy: Social Constructions of Writing within Academic Communities*, Proceedings, Second AnnualConference, 1991, Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing.

For ordering information, please contact:

The Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing
University of Minnesota
227 Lind Hall
207 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455
612-626-7579

Diversity and Writing: Dialogue within a Modern University

Proceedings
First Annual Conference
April 1990

CENTER FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES OF WRITING

MONOGRAPH SERIES • NO. 2 • 1992
LILLIAN BRIDWELL-BOWLES, SERIES EDITOR
SUSAN BATCHELDER, EDITOR

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MINNEAPOLIS, MN

Copyright © 1992 by The Board of Regents, University of Minnesota.
All Rights Reserved.

The Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing
227 Lind Hall
207 Church St. SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Director: Lillian Bridwell-Bowles, Associate Professor, English
Research Fellows: Susan Batchelder, Craig Hansen, Mark Olson, Paul Prior
Policy Board: Chris Anson, Associate Professor, English; Terence Collins, Professor, General College; Jeffrey Derby, Assistant Professor, Chemical Engineering; Gerald Rinehart, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Carlson School of Management; Billie Wahlstrom, Professor, Rhetoric

ISBN 1-881221-01-6

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilites, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

Contents

Lillian Bridwell-Bowles and Susan Batchelder
Preface v

Jacqueline Jones Royster
Part 1—Looking from the Margins: A Tale of Curricular Reform 1

Lillian Bridwell-Bowles, Jacqueline Jones Royster, Lisa Albrecht, Biman Basu, Rose Brewer, Dolores Cross, and Carol Miller
Part 2—Responses to Jacqueline Jones Royster's Keynote Address 13

Part 3—Question and Answer Session 27

Bibliography 39

Preface

This monograph is a report of the first annual conference sponsored by the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing at the University of Minnesota. The conference was entitled "Diversity and Writing: Dialogue within a Modern University," and took place April 16-19, 1990, at the University. Both the conference and the monograph support the University's goal of fostering diversity within its academic community. They also focus on one of the Center's goals: exploring the effects of ethnicity, race, class, and gender on writing.

Each year, the Center invites faculty members to propose projects, workshops, and topics in the following areas:

- characteristics of writing across the University's curriculum;
- status reports on students' writing ability at the University;
- the connections between writing and learning in all fields;
- the characteristics of writing beyond the academy;
- the effects of ethnicity, race, class, and gender on writing; and
- curricular reform through writing.

We welcome this monograph into print, especially since it has been some time since the events that it represents occurred. More immediate needs in a new Center meant that our monograph series could not be top priority with our small staff until now. We are quickly preparing a large number of important reports on grants that we have sponsored and proceedings from our conferences.

Despite the delay in publishing this particular monograph, the subject has never been more timely. At the Center's first annual conference, we had hoped to examine the ways that a writing curriculum should respond to the University's goal of fostering diversity. Given the more recent and acrid public debates about "political correctness" at the University of Texas and elsewhere, we are delighted with the respectful tone that is captured in the keynote speech and in the responses to the speaker.

Professor Jacqueline Jones Royster of Spelman College in Atlanta delivered the keynote address entitled, "Looking from the Margins: A Tale of Curricular Reform." Presented as Part 1 of this monograph, the speech outlines a broad agenda for our consideration. Professor Royster spoke from her position as a black woman, scholar, administrator, and former student. She brings all of

these perspectives into her address, speaking from firsthand experience and from her extensive knowledge as a leader in Composition Studies. Among her long list of accomplishments are such publications as *When Diversity Counts: The Teaching of Writing at UNCF Colleges and Universities* (The United Negro College Fund), which she edited, and numerous essays for *Sage: A Scholarly Journal on Black Women* for which she is a Senior Editor. She served a four-year term as Secretary of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (4C's) and is currently the Director of the Writing Center at Spelman College.

The respondents to the keynote address were invited to respond to Professor Royster's address on the day following its delivery. Each person prepared comments that would particularize Royster's comments and address additional issues. These edited comments form Part 2 of the monograph. Participants (listed below) also contributed additional references, which are included in the bibliography at the end of the monograph. We are grateful to them for their participation in the conference.

- Lisa Albrecht: Associate Professor of Composition and Women's Studies, General College.
- Biman Basu: Ph.D. candidate in the Department of English; specialist in post-colonialist theory.
- Rose Brewer: Associate Professor, Afro-American Studies and Women's Studies.
- Lillian Bridwell-Bowles: Director of the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing, and Associate Professor of English, College of Liberal Arts.
- Dolores Cross: Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (at the time of the address); currently President, Chicago State University.
- Carol Miller: Associate Professor, General College; Director, American Indian Studies.

In addition, the conference included a question and answer session in which the panel presenters, Riv-Ellen Prell (a professor in American Studies), and Anne Aronson, Robert Danberg, and Bruce Maylath (graduate students in English) spoke from the audience. The edited transcript of this discussion session appears as Part 3 of the monograph.

While this monograph touches only briefly on many important issues on the subject of diversity, we hope that it challenges the University community to consider a broader agenda for writing in the future.

Lillian Bridwell-Bowles, Director
Susan Batchelder, Research Fellow
Center for Interdisciplinary
Studies of Writing
February 1992

Part 1
Looking from the Margins:
A Tale of Curricular Reform

Jacqueline Jones Royster
Spelman College, Atlanta, Georgia

At this juncture in time, there appears to be little in the academic arena that is really more critical to us than the basic question of how it is that we, as teachers, scholars, researchers, students, and institutions, will enter the twenty-first century. There appears to be little that is more central to our future than issues of diversity and literacy development. The frameworks that we are establishing now, the decisions that we are making, the pace that we are setting are indeed what we are bound to have, and I, for one, have moments of tremendous trepidation when I consider the challenges ahead. Fortunately, though, I also have profound hope, the greatest of which comes from conferences like this one, organized by the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing. On these occasions, we have the opportunity to share scholarship and experiences, to look boldly at the ways in which we are defining our task, to engage intensely with dialectical voices so that we can find legitimate spaces within which all of us can work, teach, learn, and grow.

On these occasions, when I am called upon to try to pull out from my thinking meaningful things to say, notions that I hope will somehow be useful to whatever the interaction is, I am struck often by how audiences typically are presented thoughts without much of a sense of the passions or the predispositions behind the thinking. Much is usually left unsaid and unacknowledged. In fact, the academic arena actually encourages us to sanitize our thoughts, moving toward dispassion, toward the illusion of objectivity, toward the illusion that belief and value systems result from nature not from construction, even when we know with both our minds and our hearts that such thinking leaves us wholly unsatisfied as thinking/feeling human beings, especially if those "natural" systems somehow do not allow for our own lives and experiences.

A scratch beneath the surface of epistemological and pedagogical bases usually reveals that there are stories behind the stories. There are conscious and unconscious theoretical or philosophical frameworks, values, assumptions, conditions, passions, and predispositions, and I believe that we

would all be so much better off if we had to account for the fabric of our thinking and not just find corroboration for it. How much more enlightening it would be if we felt compelled to acknowledge conceptual pathways, underlying patterns, themes, and images. Instead, we create spaces within which we present our varying points of view as if somehow they are not shaped by life and learning. We construct worlds which imply that our visions of reality are mystically visited upon us as cardinal truths, truths about quality, goodness and beauty, about communities of discourse, curriculum, and pedagogy, about people. And, if we function with power and prestige, we have the privilege of operating from those visions ourselves, and we often have the privilege of imposing them on others.

It is within such tensions that the importance of the mission of the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing becomes critical as a reasonable response to the general ferment in academia about access to learning, the nature of scholarship, educational quality, intellectual empowerment, and academic achievement. As the new century dawns, the whole academic enterprise is being challenged, in large part, based on who and what have been privileged, on who and what have been marginalized, on how and by what circumstances achievement has and has not been acknowledged, and on the contexts and circumstances of these processes. This contemporary scenario charges us with the task of transforming theoretical paradigms, curricula, and pedagogy in ways that will be insightful, inclusive, positive, and useful.

One clear implication of this charge is that we no longer have the privilege of assuming that our visions of reality are the only ones that are preordained by nature. We can no longer claim that any way is the innately human way to the exclusion of others. We are being forced to acknowledge that each set of human experiences, and the evidence of their creative and intellectual expression, offer insight into the totality of the human experience and deserve respect as well as celebration.

I suspect, therefore, that the disclosure of underpinnings, the acknowledging of points of view, bodies of experience, frames of reference, values, and priorities will be essential elements in bringing about substantive and meaningful change in the ways in which we talk about and conduct education. We have to know more about the hearts and the souls that nurture the thoughts, visions, and actions by which we landscape this academic arena, and because of changing demographics and economic bases, we will also have to acknowledge the multiple roles that race, class, gender, and ethnicity have played and still are playing in the garnering of knowledge, power, authority, and dominion.

In my own case, I operate from a vision of reality that is very much informed by my race, gender, class, ethnicity, and also by time. I came of age during the infamous sixties. Those were the days of dreamers, and many of us were imprinted by these visionaries to be optimistic, to have hope, to be idealistic, to cherish the ability to imagine other worlds, even in the face of despair.

The sixties were also the days of social upheaval and of constant and pervasive violence, up close and personal. In fact, a memory that I will probably take to my grave occurred on the night that Martin Luther King, Jr., was killed. My friends and I walked through the gates of our college

campus very late on the evening of April 4, 1968, on our way to a rally at a neighboring campus, only to be met by patrolling police cars with shotguns pointed out of the windows. At the time, I wondered what exactly they expected us to do and how ready were they to pull those triggers if we stepped or looked the "wrong" way, by whatever definitions they were using at the time. In 1968, being a college student could often be a very dangerous endeavor.

Another memory that stands out for me was watching the 1968 Democratic National Convention, the one that happened in the streets. I watched as men, who were sanctioned by the legal system of Chicago, attacked and brutalized white college students. I remember thinking, "If they will do that to their own children, what in heaven's name will they do to me?" A small voice somewhere in my consciousness said to me, "Don't ask. The answer just may be too frightening to think about."

Actually, though, I was rather marginalized on my small, southern, black college campus to the "fire of that time," but my optimism and my idealism were radicalized by what I saw, heard, and experienced. It was indeed a unique time in this country's history, and I emerged from the experience compelled to stand up for my beliefs and to act based on them. I was inspired to have courage, to be willful, strong, and tenacious.

Further, as a southern-born and -bred person from a small town in Georgia that is well-rooted in its Bible belt mentality, I was also raised to believe in the dominion of the spirit over mind and body; in balance, justice, freedom; and in equality. I was taught to allow passion and compassion to occupy their places of honor in the company of intellect and social consciousness. I was raised to have faith that goodness will prevail and that it will do so in response to hard and vigilant work from individual hands. I grew up able to see for myself in the segregated world around me that the work of individual hands can indeed wring out miracles.

These experiences and beliefs, in their essence, constitute the fertile ground out of which my view of the effects of marginality on writing instruction, and thereby on curriculum reform, emerges. In addition to the fact of my race, my socio-economic class, and my gender (that is, being African-American, female, and more middle-class aspiring than middle-class standing), these worlds significantly shaped my vision, values, and priorities, and if you look between the words and lines of what I say, you will find that these notions linger still.

Through these lenses, then, I see that the world of academia has identified a secure place for higher order literacy skills as primary mechanisms for scholarly investigation, documentation, discourse, and sometimes even change. Those who enter this domain must be able to think and learn well. They must be able to find and solve problems thoughtfully and creatively in keeping with and in dialectical opposition to disciplinary values and expectations, and they must also be able to demonstrate their abilities through writing.

As we refine our theoretical and pedagogical bases, one recurrent theme seems to be that writing is a generative process which facilitates thinking and plays a significant role in both personal growth

and academic achievement. Evidence has mounted for the notion that writing can be used to liberate thought, garner power, and gain authority, that it facilitates the search for and affirmation of self. As such, writing instruction, just as the curriculum and the process of education in general, becomes a political phenomenon, racked inherently with complexities which influence and shape both ways of seeing and ways of being and which go quite far to restrain or to augment individual action and control, and thereby the maintenance and operation of societies.[1]

A fundamental question, therefore, becomes whether or not classroom instruction and curricular processes are used to the advantage or to the disadvantage of students in general and marginalized students in particular. How are instructional paradigms and curricular frameworks determined and established? How are they used? What is the extent to which they are used in the service of individual students as they seek self-actualization as thinkers, learners, members of a race, a socio-economic class, a gender, a culture? What is the extent to which instruction and curriculum are used in the maintenance of social norms which are established, perhaps, by fingers that rest on the pulse of the status quo? Are there other uses being served as well?

A consideration of the political ramifications of literacy instruction and curriculum in tne lives of students reveals several points of tension:

1. in terms of what our teaching and research are demonstrating to be the potential of writing as a generative process;
2. in terms of what our teaching and research are demonstrating to be the potential of a curriculum balanced by race, class, gender, and ethnicity as dictated, for example, by the role that tolerance must play if world peace is to prevail;
3. in terms of what our educational systems, as an instrument of mainstream culture, has demonstrated that it desires and endorses, i.e., homogeneity, conformity, and empowerment privileged toward white, upper- and middle-class males who have Eurocentric perspectives;
4. in terms of students' experiences as they match and don't match the experiences that are privileged in classrooms and in society.

Certainly, as teachers and scholars, we are coming to understand writing as it facilitates the discovery and definition of self; as it enhances and empowers thinking; as it facilitates ideological revolution and change; and as it helps to manifest political and social action. As we look again, however, we are also coming to understand the consequences of the ways in which societal institutions, including educational ones, systemically impose restraints as these institutions participate in the construction of our social reality. The most obvious of these restraints occurs by means of curricula and by the ways in which institutions set or do not set educational policies and procedures.

Consequently, we must examine with great care the ways in which we support students' uses of writing and the ways in which we help them to define the content and context of learning, as well as their own sphere of responsibility, authority, and operation. We must question both ways of being

and ways of doing for them, for ourselves, and for the systems which impact upon us all.

Perhaps the most dynamic vision of the potential of writing instruction and curriculum reform underscores the need to find comfort with the discomfort and the chaos of constant growth and change. This type of dynamic vision for instruction and curriculum supports, in quite real terms, a quest for adventure with ideas, a search for possibilities, for other ways and means. This type of vision recognizes that we have little choice but to seek to be inclusive in embracing breadth, depth, and diversity. Such adventure, such lines of inquiry open new and provocative questions about the process of education in this country, and thereby about the very nature of what we have come to understand about the academic world and what we have come to normalize within it.

At this point, I'd like to contextualize this way of viewing instruction and curriculum reform within a particular human experience and retell a story that was told in 1892 by Anna Julia Cooper in an essay entitled, "The Higher Education of Women."

> In the very first year of our century, the year of 1801, there appeared in Paris a book by Silvain Marechal, entitled *Shall Woman Learn the Alphabet.* The book proposes a law prohibiting the alphabet to women, and quotes authorities weighty and various, to prove that the woman who knows the alphabet has already lost part of her womanliness . . . that if women were once permitted to read Sophocles and work with logarithms, or to nibble at any side of the apple of knowledge, there would be an end forever to their sewing on buttons and embroidering slippers.
>
> Please remember this book was published at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century. At the end of its first third, (in the year 1833) one solitary college in America decided to admit women within its sacred precincts, and organized what was called a "Ladies' Course" as well as the regular B.A. or Gentlemen's course.
>
> It was felt to be an experiment—a rather dangerous experiment—and was adopted with fear and trembling by the good fathers, who looked as if they had been caught secretly mixing explosive compounds and were guiltily expecting every moment to see the foundations under them shaken and rent and their fair superstructure shattered into fragments.
>
> But the girls came, and there was no upheaval. They performed their tasks modestly and intelligently. Once in a while one or two were found choosing the gentlemen's course. Still no collapse; and the dear, careful, scrupulous, frightened old professors were just getting their hearts out of their throats and preparing to draw one good free breath, when they found they would have to change the names of those courses; for there were as many ladies in the gentlemen's course as in the ladies', and a distinctly Ladies' Course, inferior in scope and aim to the regular classical course, did not and could not exist.
>
> Other colleges gradually fell into line, and today there are one hundred and ninety-eight colleges for women, and two hundred and seven coeducational colleges and universities in the United States alone offering the degree of B.A. to women, and sending out yearly into the arteries of this nation a warm, rich flood of strong, brave, active, energetic, well-equipped, thoughtful women . . . women who can think as well as feel,

> and who feel none the less because they think . . . women who have given a deeper, richer, nobler and grander meaning to the word "womanly" than any one-sided masculine definition could ever have suggested or inspired.[2]

In the opening of this essay, Cooper is obviously presenting a case for the rights of women to higher education. She speaks quite eloquently of the fears, the unfounded fears, that human beings often have in the face of change, even when it's for the benefit of us all. Clearly, given the furor in recent years about educational quality, human beings are still victimized by their fears.

One additional point worth noting is that Cooper was an African-American woman. She was born a slave but went on to obtain a doctorate from the Sorbonne and to become an educational leader as well as a community activist. In reflecting on her experiences in school, she stated: "I constantly felt (as I suppose many an ambitious girl has felt) a thumping from within unanswered by any beckoning from without."[3]

In recontextualizing this story within the framework of instruction and curriculum reform, we can see that a recurring tension in academic environments has been what to do with groups of citizens who do not conform to normalized, socially constructed definitions, values, and assumptions because of their race, class, gender, and/or ethnicity, but who keep insisting that there should be access, equity, justice, and empowerment for all. African-American women constitute one group that often falls victim in these situations, not only because of race, gender, and ethnicity, but quite often because of class as well. The realities of our lives in all of their diversity, even within the group, paint a compelling portrait of the ways and means of intellectual survival in the face of a matrix of oppressions, and we offer a provocative message for others who struggle within contemporary socio-political contexts to develop scholarly potential and to nurture intellectual growth and academic achievement. African-American women are among the nation's most marginalized citizens.

Given rising concerns about academia's diminishing pool of racially diverse scholars, a pivotal question becomes how do we establish curricula to train and nurture any students, but most especially those who have been marginalized by race, class, gender, and ethnicity? How do we accomplish this task in such a way that the students are well-prepared to gain access to academe and to achieve there as productive writers and scholars? How do we structure programs and maintain classroom and extra-classroom environments so that students are encouraged to excel, to go beyond boundaries to maximum potential; so that they receive the kinds of nourishment which help them to shape and direct themselves intellectually and as productive members of the culture; so that major portions of their energy and creativity are not always directed toward identifying solutions for world problems?

In this type of intricate inquiry process, personal experience can assume a rather dynamic role since it can reasonably serve as a barometer for what Eugene Gendlin termed a "felt sense" of the

authenticity of conclusions.[4] I acknowledge, therefore, that my first-person experience provides invaluable data for this experience.

As an African-American female (encumbered by race, class, gender, and ethnicity), I have been taught well by my own efforts to survive, to operate productively, and to feel healthy within the academic domain. Because of the very nature of inquiry in the humanities, I have developed the fundamental habit of these disciplines "to expose and question the aesthetic, moral, cultural, and epistemological assumptions which govern our behavior and our society."[5] I have had opportunities to operate with a multiple consciousness, but most especially, to perceive and to process my experiences in these multi-dimensional ways with a tremendous amount of viscera, reflection, and analysis.

In fact, within the particular contexts of typical academic environments (which inevitably show the evidence of racism, sexism, classism, and ethnocentricism), the polarization of my heart, spirit, and mind against covert and overt socio-political barriers has often placed me, as it does other marginalized people, at the mercy of a vise, identified in 1903 by William E.B. DuBois. This vise demands that the marginalized must operate dialogically both within their experiences and beyond them, maintaining, in DuBois's vocabulary: "a sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his twoness—an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder."[6]

The growth in our understanding of marginality since DuBois, however, is reflected by bell hooks: "Living as we did—on the edge—we developed a particular way of seeing reality. We looked both from the outside in and from the inside out . . . a mode of seeing unknown to most of our oppressors, that sustained us, aided us in our struggle to transcend poverty and despair, strengthened our sense of self and our solidarity."[7]

Given hooks's analysis, there have been distinct advantages for me in academe in choosing to work within the context of Spelman College, the oldest and largest institution of higher education in the world for women of African descent. In the continuous struggle to carve out the almost obligatory "margin-center" space, I have sought within an environment designed for women like myself to create an kind of proactive, rather than reactive vision. I have perceived the need to fashion multiconscious mechanisms (information, skills, strategies, perspectives, experiences) which support the academic way but which also breed fortitude for what I have perceived to be oppositional forces to positive and productive development. The effort, being personal (i.e., being rooted in my own lived experiences), not just empathic, has allowed for an intellectual intensity which is vested with the right of passion and compassion, and also with a recognition of the need for positive change.

I acknowledge, then, the ways of seeing and knowing that I bring to this educational challenge based on what my own life as learner, writer, teacher, and scholar has wrought. Further, as a teacher

in the never-ending search for mechanisms to bring about positive change in the lives of students, I underscore the saliency of questions, not just about who is privileged toward the center, i.e., the mainstream of academia, or who is still left out, but also about how we can bring balance to the residual and the ongoing effects of negative factors in the daily lives of the marginalized.

One rather generalized residual effect is in terms of prototypical images. African-American women, like other marginalized people, get caught in the twilight realities of prevailing assumptions about abilities and performance. For example, even a cursory glance through academic conference and convention programs, workshop titles, or an occasional scholarly article presents still a dominant image of blacks and Hispanics especially as monolithic groups of unsuccessful learners, inexperienced readers and writers, and sometimes eager but always underprepared low achievers. Obviously, the oppressions of racism and economics make these descriptors all too accurate for far too many who belong to these groups, African-American women included. But what about those group members who do not fit these categories? How aggressive must they be in order to be seen as themselves rather than as the prototype? How are we accounting for actual learning potential and needs, rather than presumed ones? How do we allow strength to show through the fog of our ways of educating, our ways of teaching, and our ways of assessing achievement?

The fact is that learners, despite the specifics of their possible marginalization, can cover the full range of academic potential and achievement from the very top of the scales to the very bottom. In addition to unprepared and underprepared students, there are also well-prepared ones, average ones, some who are prepared in some areas and not in others, all of whom could conceivably be nurtured in ways which could encourage higher levels of performance and achievement. As professional educators, therefore, we must be much more consciously aware of cultural, social, political, and economic complexities so that we can recognize negatively charged assumptions which point us much too often toward minimal expectations, strategies, and measures rather than maximum ones.

Another residual effect became evident to me rather accidentally. I am the director of a mentoring program designed for students who define themselves as writers and scholars, the Sage Writer/ Scholars Internship Program. It began in 1985 as a cooperative endeavor of the Spelman College Women's Research and Resource Center, the Comprehensive Writing Program, and *Sage: A Scholarly Journal on Black Women*. Very early in this project, I happened to ask two obvious questions: How many of you consider yourselves to be writers? How many consider yourselves to be young scholars, young intellectuals? The answers to the second questions caught me off guard. I found, as I expected to find, that the interns were rather comfortable in claiming themselves as writers and as competent and capable people who expect to be successful. What I also found, though, was that they were not so eager to claim and name themselves as scholars, as intellectual beings. I was surprised although I should not have been.

At Spelman College in 1985, there were not pedagogical or curricular structures in place to

encourage students to claim space as intellectuals. We did not have the African-American woman scholar who is now our president as a reflective model. We did not have a thinking across the curriculum project. We did not have an active Sage Writer/Scholars Internship Program. We were just beginning. We did not have a "Life of the Mind" series. At the time, the Living-Learning Program did not operate as an extra-classroom experience to nurture relationships between faculty and other mentors and students. We did not talk about black women as intellectuals in any systematic way. What we talked about and nurtured was an image of black women as achievers, as creative and ingenious beings, as leaders, but not really as thinkers, as scholars, as intellectuals. Fortunately for us, times and images change.

This initial discovery, therefore, became a window of opportunity which led me to wonder about how we, as African-American women, have defined and internalized the tradition of black feminist thought; about how power operates in our culture and our schools and the extent to which the emergent conditions and circumstances impact on our abilities to operate as intellectuals or scholars; about how we manage to overcome institutionalized barriers to achievement and to our own intellectual selves; and about how answers to these three questions can inform the ways in which we develop intellectual potential and nurture growth and achievement for the full range of abilities which we find in our classrooms.

I consider it very good fortune that I actually asked the students these questions about their perceptions of themselves. If I had not, we could have assumed too much about them. Instead, we have been able to use their hesitations at that moment to inform and to energize how we go about operating the program. We became more conscious of the nature of the task. That piece of information enabled us to see more clearly the territory that we had carved out and to envision our efforts with an enriched sense of our values and priorities.

One fundamental assumption was intensified. We were much clearer about the need for environmental change, and we were even more determined to use the program as a testing ground. We felt that this extra-classroom environment could provide a lower risk place to think about ways to enhance learning and to operationalize learners. We were strengthened in our hopes that our efforts would be useful in both the classroom environment and institutional planning. We assumed that our Spelman experiences might have implications for other students, marginalized and non-marginalized.

Basically, we sought to enliven the intellectual atmosphere at Spelman through a specified array of extra-classroom activities. We coordinated workshops on writing, thinking, and publishing; visits with mentors; trips to scholarly conferences. We encouraged students to submit manuscripts to *Sage*. We encouraged students and faculty in their joint research efforts. We structured dialogues on issues that impact upon our contemporary lives. We encouraged them to use their classroom experiences more boldly, to listen carefully, to read broadly, to question, to take authority and

responsibility for themselves as learners. We urged them to be self-directed, to listen to the voices from within for what Howard Thurman, a noted theologian, calls "the sound of the genuine."[8] In actuality, we structured a program for them that we wished someone had structured for us as young women two decades before.

So, what have we learned about instruction and curriculum reform over the last five years? Obviously, the time remaining does not permit justice in answering this question, but three points stand out as particularly significant. Two are from the perspective of students:

1. Students need to understand their "intellectual ancestry."[9]
2. They need to understand power and how they are affected by it.[10]

I believe that students are in a much stronger position to fashion for themselves their own authority to speak, to write, to learn, and to produce if they know their own history and if they are able to contextualize their personal genesis as writers and scholars within the broad cloth of human experiences globally.

The third point is from the perspective of instruction and curriculum. We need to shape theoretical and pedagogical paradigms:

- that embrace a curriculum that is balanced by race, class, gender, and ethnicity;
- that encourage students to hold the inquiry open, to resist coming to closure too quickly;
- that encourage thoughtfulness and creativity, and sustain the taking of high risks;
- that support the use of multiple measures of performance.

In other words, we can establish and maintain more inclusive paradigms, which invite students to bring all of their individual selves into the learning environment and which encourage us all (students, teachers, researchers, scholars, and institutions) to break through barriers of race, class, gender, and ethnicity. I believe that such paradigms will allow us to see that safety is in learning, not in ignorance. We can value, validate, and affirm diversity, not only for those who operate in the margins, but for those at the center as well.

In fact, the real challenge to our educational system may just be in finding ways to encourage people who are automatically placed and who place themselves at the center to unlock the barriers to their own marginality, their own "other-ness." The key to success may actually be in getting the empowered to recognize how each human being in relation to other human beings is sometimes, if not always, "other" for any number of reasons. The mandate may reveal that change will have to come from all of our individual hands, not just from the hands of women, or the hands of people of color, or the economically disenfranchised, or other marginalized groups. We may begin to see that to make things work, we will all have to participate—actively, passionately, compassionately.

We could actually be bold and courageous and imagine a vibrant culture based on the collective authority of our individually "felt senses" of "other," rather than on the narrowly delineated and often arrogant sense of "center" which we traditionally find in educational settings. We could create

a new and different educational agenda. We could say that this culture is the greatest manifestation of diversity ever known, and that we are ready, willing, and able to live up to our pledge of freedom, justice, and equality for all.

NOTES

[1] Central to the scholarship on the politics of literacy has been Paulo Friere. See *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum, 1988).

[2] Anna Julia Cooper, *A Voice from the South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 48-51.

[3] Cooper 76.

[4] Eugene Gendlin, *Focusing* (New York: Everest House, 1978). For an application of this concept to the composing process, see also Sondra Perl, "Understanding Composing," *CCC* (December 1980), 363-369.

[5] George Levine, et al., *Speaking for the Humanities* (New York: American Council of Learned Societies, 1989), 33.

[6] W.E.B. DuBois, *Souls of Black Folk* (New York: New American Library, 1969), 45.

[7] bell hooks, *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center* (Boston, MA: South End Press, 1984), Preface.

[8] Howard Thurman, "The Sound of the Genuine," Founders' Day Address, Spelman College, Atlanta, April 11, 1981.

[9] See Nancy Chodorow, *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978); Carolyn G. Heilbrun, *Reinventing Womanhood* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1979); Lydia Sargent, ed., *Woman and Revolution* (Boston: South End Press, 1981); Mary O'Brien, "The Commatization of Women: Patriarchal Fetishism in the Sociology of Education, *Interchange* 15 (1984), 43-60; Deidre David, *Intellectual Women and Victorian Patriarchy: Harriet Martineau, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, George Eliot* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987).

[10] See Roberta Hall and Bernice Sandler, *The Classroom Climate: A Chilly One for Women?* (Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges, 1982); *Sage: A Scholarly Journal on Black Women* 1 (Spring 1984); Barbara Miller Solomon, *In the Company of Educated Women: A History of Women in Higher Education* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985); Patricia Hill Collins and Margaret L. Anderson, eds., *An Inclusive Curriculum: Race, Class, and Gender in Sociological Instruction* (Washington, DC: American Sociological Association, 1987); Lois Weiss, ed., *Class, Race, and Gender in American Education* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988); Carol S. Pearson, Donna L. Shavlik, and Judith G. Touchton, eds. *Educating the Majority: Women Challenge Tradition in Higher Education* (New York: American Council on Education, 1989).

Part 2
Responses to Jacqueline Jones Royster's Keynote Address

The remarks below were taken from a transcript of the discussion of Professor Royster's remarks on the day following her address. Respondents read a text of her speech in advance and prepared individual responses to it from a variety of perspectives.

Opening remarks by Lillian Bridwell-Bowles

We had a wonderful beginning to this conference last night, when Jacqueline Jones Royster from Spelman College, who is seated before you in the green and gold, gave a keynote address challenging us, essentially from her experience and from her individual perspective, to consider some alternatives to our curriculum here at the University of Minnesota. We knew in advance that there would be much in her talk that we would want to discuss so we set up this forum today to invite a number of people from campus to respond to her address. We intend that their remarks will just get the ball rolling so that you will also feel free to tell us what you think our initiatives should be with regard to writing and diversity at the University of Minnesota.

So what I'll do is introduce the people here at the table and then afterward, if you want to speak, please identify yourself and do your own introduction so that we'll know who you are.

I'm Lillian Bridwell-Bowles and I'm the Director of the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing. This is our first conference. It's really partly a celebration of our first year and we're delighted to be able to have this event.

On the panel to my left, we have, first of all, Dolores Cross, Associate Provost and Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs for the University of Minnesota. To her left is Carol Miller, who is an Associate Professor in the General College. Then we have Rose Brewer who is an Associate Professor in Afro-American Studies. Jacqueline Jones Royster whom I've already mentioned. And we have Lisa Albrecht, who is an Assistant Professor in General College and

Biman Basu, who is a Ph.D. candidate in English. We'll proceed in alphabetical order, and Lisa Albrecht will be the first speaker.

For the benefit of those of you who were not here last night when Jackie spoke, I've asked Jackie to give us just a short summary of the key issues that she saw that needed to be raised here. So Jackie, if you'll begin.

Summary of the Keynote Address by Jacqueline Jones Royster

Okay. You all saw that in the brochure what I was trying to do was to use my own experiences as a teacher and as a marginalized person to talk about issues of curriculum reform and the teaching of writing. There were about six points that I thought were rather basic to what I was trying to say. One is that curricula must change. I think above all else that was the message that I wanted to have made clear. Curricula must change. And I believe they should because they do not equitably represent the lives, conditions, contributions, and history of the American people in all of our diversity or of our lives within a global context. And I believe that the curriculum as the embodiment of national culture, spirit, and values must do that. So that means change. In the very least, I believe that curricular paradigms must be balanced by race, class, gender, and ethnicity.

The second thing is that I think that all sectors of the college/university community have to be involved in the change and also to experience the effects of it. I don't believe that these kinds of changes are to be implemented by only the women or only the people of color, nor by only the people who are disenfranchised in some other ways. I think that everybody has a responsibility to participate, but I also believe that everyone benefits from the experience so that the courses, for example, are not just for the benefit of margin dwellers. They are for the benefit of everyone. We can all, in other words, stand some "otherizing." That helps us to know things a little bit better.

The third thing is that pedagogy should be flexible and learner centered. I believe that it should invite diverse experiences, allow for active learning, and encourage inquiry, thoughtfulness and creativity.

I also believe that assessment has to be flexible. That there should be multiple ways of finding and measuring talent.

The fifth thing is that as a pedagogical strategy, writing can be used as I said last night, to liberate thought, garner power, and gain authority. It can enhance and empower thinking. It facilitates the search for and affirmation of self. It helps to manifest political and social action. In that sense, it's a very important tool that students can use in a variety of ways. What we have to do as teachers is to support students' varied uses of writing as thinkers, learners, problem solvers, and communicators,

but also as human beings in the finding and affirmation of self.

And the last point that I want to reiterate is that I believe that from experiences that I've had with students on our campus in my own classes as well as in a special project that I talked about last night, I've come to understand that they need to have a much clearer sense of their intellectual ancestry. They need to know their own history, and they need to be able to contextualize their personal genesis as people, as writers and scholars within what I call the broadcloth of human experiences globally. What that ultimately means on one level is that there is, especially for marginalized students, also a critical need to understand power and how it affects them.

Panel Presentations

A response to the keynote by Lisa Albrecht

Rather than paraphrasing one particular paragraph in Jackie's paper, I want to read from it:

> [T]he real challenge to our educational system may just be in finding ways to encourage people who are automatically placed or who place themselves at the center to unlock the barriers to their own marginality, their own otherness. The key to success may actually be in getting the empowered to recognize how each human being in relation to other human beings is sometimes, if not always, "other" for a number of reasons.

That's what really sparked me. I want to talk about this concept of margin and center and how some of us by the nature of our skin color, and I speak of white people, automatically place ourselves at the center. I also want to mention that this concept of "from margin to center" has been written about by bell hooks, who is a black feminist writer, in *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center.*

It seems important that when we talk about margin and center, we define what we mean by margin and center. For example, in General College, we're trying to figure out how to do multicultural education in a systematic way by placing it at the center of our work. One way we're doing that is by doing a survey that is going to administration, faculty, student board members, civil service people, and student services personnel, asking everyone in the College several questions: 1) How do you define multicultural education? 2) What are examples of multicultural education that you do in your own work? And 3) What dilemmas do they see? We also want to explore what's rich and empowering about doing this work, because for many of us it's been an exhilarating intellectual endeavor. We're going to do an ethnographic analysis of this survey to come up with our own definitions of multicultural education. So rather than taking definitions from other people (which often places multicultural

education as outside the mainstream), it's going to emerge from us in the work that we're doing. That feels important to do, that we're not putting definitions on us, we're creating our definitions.

It seems to me that we also have to think about transformation on three levels—personal, pedagogical, and institutional—if we're going to consider changing what is at the margins and the center.

At the personal level, each of us has work to do in the academic community and in our own communities outside of the university to understand who we are in the world and why we see ourselves at the center or at the margin or, for most of us, at both places at different points in time based on our identities.

For me, that means as a white person, I have to keep recognizing that diversity isn't something that's threatening. It's something that enriches my life. And what helps me do that is looking at who I am and all the pieces of my identity. I look at my ethnicity as a Jew, at my class background, originally working class, and at my sexual identity as a lesbian, and what that means, and how I connect with different communities. That means looking at choices I make. For example, I choose to be an editor of a gay and lesbian literary magazine (*Evergreen Chronicles: A Journal of Gay and Lesbian Literature*), which is a way to connect to a community that's part of who I am. That helps me look at where I am, margin and center, and what forefronts at different points in my life.

I also want to discuss transformation in the classroom. What affects me most is thinking about the work of Paulo Freire. What I try to bring to all my classrooms in both Women's Studies and General College, is a pattern of observing and listening to students, not going in as an authority, but seeing who's there and listening, and not talking that much. What unfolds for me from observing and listening is questioning and engaging in dialogue with students to see what their issues are and what problems there are. We then reflect together and figure out how best to act.

Classroom transformation also means designing ways to assess what we're doing in our classrooms and in our programs. How do we assess the impact of multicultural education? How best to do it? That makes me think that in the writing classroom, we need to teach the language of wider communication, not just the language of academe. I grapple with issues of standard English and what language gets spoken in my classroom and on the page and in the halls of General College and the halls outside Women's Studies, on the street, in our homes and how all those communities have to be a part of my classroom, not just standard English, because I have to value all those languages, and so must the academy.

Institutionally, in terms of transformation, I think we need to take responsibility for faculty and staff development systematically so that we're not randomly guessing at how to do cultural diversity in our classrooms. We have done many programs here. There's a Ford Foundation grant here at the University of Minnesota on curriculum transformation. It does work systematically on issues of diversity as faculty redesign syllabi.

Institutionally, we have to continue to do work breaking down disciplinary barriers so that we not only talk about writing across the curriculum, but also about gender and multicultural concerns across the curriculum as well. How do we do this systematically? What programs do we have in place?

Do we hire people of color and women as more than individual tokens in departments? How do we have role models in our classrooms? Why aren't there greater numbers of women and people of color doing this work on our campuses? We need those kinds of institutional changes. So I would hope that when we talk about transformation, we talk about it on all these fronts—personally, pedagogically, and institutionally, because to do work changing who's at the margin and who's at the center, all these pieces have to change. That's what I'd like us to think about.

A response to the keynote by Biman Basu

Responding today to a paper called "Looking from the Margins: A Tale of Curricular Reform," it may be fortunate or unfortunate that tomorrow I have to present a paper at Michigan at a conference called "Revisioning Knowledge and the Curriculum: Feminist Perspectives."

I want to start with a quotation, or really two short ones, one from Alice Walker's *Meridian* and the other from Gloria Naylor's *Linden Hills*.

From *Meridian* (about Saxon College):

> The fence that surrounded the campus was hardly noticeable from the street and appeared from the outside to be more of an attempt at ornamentation than an effort to contain or exclude. Only the students who lived on campus learned, often painfully, that the beauty of a fence is no guarantee that it will not keep one penned in as securely as one that is ugly.

From *Linden Hills* (Lester talking to his friend, Willie White):

> Fences, White, fences. Even at the university. Thick stone fences. And why? The gates are open so it's not to keep anybody out or in. Why fences? To get you used to the idea that what they have in there is different—special. Something to be separated from the rest of the world. Then when they have fenced you in from six years old till you're 26, they can let you out because you're ready to believe that what they have given you up here—their version of life—is special. And you fence your own self in after that, protecting it from everybody else out there. They gotta be sure that when you go out among real people your fences are all intact. Then when you move to Linden Hills or

wherever, you're gonna stay put and help vote out radicals and heave a sigh of relief when you read that a Panther got it in the back from an L.A. cop.

It seems that at conferences such as these, part of what we do is try to figure out and determine the nature of these fences, how to tear them down, get around them, jump over them, whatever. A sentence from Jacqueline Royster's paper: "In fact, within the particular context of typical, academic environments, which inevitably show their evidence of racism, sexism, classism, and ethnocentrism, the polarization of my heart, spirit and mind against covert and overt social political barriers has often placed me, as it does other marginalized people, at the mercy of a vise."

I'm working for Dr. Rose Brewer right now in a project that examines the impact of race, class, and gender on writing—student writing. We haven't really finished that but that is the point of entry in this paper that I want to open up a dialogue on.

My training is pretty much in literature, although I've been acquainted with composition theory for a while. So I want to address what literary theory, specifically black feminist literary theory, has contributed towards the study and mention a little bit of what we've done in terms of race, class, and gender in composition theory.

Hortense Spillers in a book, *Conjuring*, says, "The community of black women writing in the United States now can be regarded as a vivid new fact of national life." [See Pryse and Spillers in the bibliography.] I would like to add that the community of black feminist theoreticians can also be regarded as an established fact. They have articulated the central theoretical concerns, starting perhaps in 1977 with Barbara Smith in "Toward a Black Feminist Criticism." There she says, "A black feminist approach to literature embodies the realization that the politics of sex as well as race and class are crucially interlocking factors." She elsewhere calls for an integrated analysis and practice based upon the fact that major systems of oppression are interlocking.

Underscoring the need for an integrated analysis, Smith insists that race, class, and gender operate simultaneously. She says elsewhere—this is, I think, coming from *Homegirls*, her introduction to that volume. "Denying that sexual oppression exists or requiring that we wait to bring it out until racism or in some cases, capitalism, is toppled, is a bankrupt position. A black feminist perspective has no use for ranking oppressions but instead demonstrates the simultaneity of oppressions as they affect third world women's rights."

Isolating one component of the system for analysis is just methodologically not viable. I think from the 1977 article a bold line of critics have developed an analysis in Smith's terms: Barbara Christian, Hazel Carby, Hortense Spillers, and most remarkably, I think, Mae Henderson.

I want to just jump to Mae Henderson's work. Although critics have questioned, qualified, and otherwise critiqued Smith's perceptions, one cannot doubt that race, class, and gender constitute a distinctive matrix of black women's writing. In a book called *Changing our Own Words*, which I think

is one of the latest and most theoretically sophisticated collections of essays, Mae Henderson bases her interpretations on what she refers to as "the simultaneity of discourse," echoing Barbara Smith's term "simultaneity of oppressions."

Henderson's dialogics of difference and dialectic of identity represent a working out of a theory of positionality, a theory based on the position of the black woman. This position, taking into account the simultaneous operations of race, class, and gender, empowers the black woman to speak a simultaneous discourse, or as Henderson would put it, "to speak in tongues." That's one valuable insight that I think literary theory from Barbara Smith to Mae Henderson has contributed in the study of the matrix of race, class, gender.

In composition theory, I'm not sure at this point if we can say the same thing, that these advances have been made. However, in an article called "Race, Class and Gender in Education Research: An Argument for Integrative Analysis," Carl Grant and Christine Sleeter observe that "there is compelling evidence that young people construct views of reality within the material and cultural contexts of their lives and that these contexts are shaped partly by the status groups to which they belong." In their analysis of seventy-one articles, however, they state that only three focused on all three social forces. Of these three, only one integrated them, and this one examined factors related to dropping out of school.

I'll stop there, but it seems again, from Jacqueline Royster's paper, that academia has persisted in presenting images of blacks and Hispanics as monolithic groups of unsuccessful learners, whereas Mae Henderson, for example, would see this position as one of empowerment. That's what I hope to see in my work with Dr. Brewer, how this can be an empowering position.

A response to the keynote by Rose Brewer

Good point to begin. I am quite excited about our project mainly because it involves looking at the writing of young black women on this campus and it brings together a number of social forces including writing as well as teaching as well as thinking across many, many disciplines.

As I listened to Professor Royster last night, for me she was extremely evocative. That was the word that best captured what she did for me. We share a good deal of common ground, so she evoked emotion. She evoked insight. She evoked possibilities. And clearly she evoked questions in my mind about how to achieve so many of the things that we need to achieve in the academy and in the world.

Most crucially in terms of her observations for me were the ones about the creation of a multicultural academy. And I use the notion of academy rather than curricula because I think

essentially that's what we're looking at. To create a multicultural environment does not require a simple reading. There are a number of complexities. It's more than, or it should be more than, a "cultural fiction" to borrow some terminology from Hazel Carby.

We need to use a critical eye, in fact, to assess the recent efforts to incorporate diversity into colleges and universities. We need to look very critically historically at what has come before us. And I think oftentimes, people in the U.S. do not have a real good historical perspective. Whenever I talk about curriculum transformation and the creation of a multicultural academy, I always say that this isn't the first time in the history of the U.S. that it's happened. As a matter of fact, James Banks does a very nice historical treatment of at least three key points in time when we've engaged in the same kind of enterprise.

During the period of the 1880s into the turn of the century when hundreds of thousands of Southeast European immigrants were coming to this country, there was a good deal of talk about how they could be normalized, how they could be brought into the so-called center, to use the center-margin vocabulary. And needless to say, the effort was to render mute their experience, to treat it as not usable and somehow to Americanize them. There were very few voices opposing this kind of orientation. One being a man named Horace Caylin, who has a little known attempt to say that these individuals brought something very unique and important in their cultures. And he coined that term which has become very popular in university circles, cultural pluralism. And he argued for a cultural pluralistic society.

Twenty, thirty, forty years into the twentieth century, hundreds of thousands of African Americans left the South to go to the North and East through what I would call a push-pull motion, being pushed out of a violent, horrendous land that did not honor them, being pulled into an industrial, capitalist society that would treat them as less than wage slaves. But clearly, there were those who had an eye on somehow normaiizing these new immigrants too, despite the prism of race. And racism was very intense. And to Americanize an African American was seen as something that was really not possible, but clearly to make them more acceptable to this Northeastern European environment was on the lips of some people. As a matter of fact, Banks referred to an attempt to engage in intercultural education at the secondary as well as at the university levels. There was an intercultural committee that attempted to develop a series of rules around: How do we relate to people of different racial and ethnic groups? This particular movement didn't go very far. It didn't go much farther than the paper it was written on because of the silencing of many of the advocates. Certainly because of the quietude of the fifties, a very misleading quietude which gave rise to what I would call a third transformation or a third phase of this multicultural effort.

But in this sense, it came from the bottom instead of being imposed from the top. The initial two efforts have been given from above. But as you all know, many of you who have lived through the sixties, the voices from the margin became very hard and harsh and vocal, and women's studies,

black studies, other ethnic studies became very much a part of the creation of, if not a multicultural world, at least a world that recognized the history and the strength of the people from the margin. I would say that what we're facing today is basically a fourth phase of this transformation. I say this repeatedly in my talks. And it reflects a tremendous effort on the part of the universities across this country to deal with a changing demographics, with the fact that in states such as California and Texas, there are large numbers of Asian and Hispanic and other immigrants of color who have now made that state a majority-minority state. I don't know what that means, but that's what they call it. And the University of Minnesota has found itself a part of this dialogue with its curriculum change projects, with its attempts at multiculturalism, with its attempts at making a gender-fair and racially-ethnic-fair curriculum.

But as I said earlier, this is not a simple undertaking. And I think Professor Royster makes us see, although there's a historical precedent for it, the realization of it takes much more. There are, in a sense, several levels that we need to address in creating a multicultural academy. I thought I would focus more specifically on the issue or the question of how writing plays into this. I know much of my work with the Ford Foundation project has been on how faculty change their syllabi, how they begin teaching courses to reflect this margin, and how they make established disciplinary rules about learning and teaching and pedagogy, how they transform those. It seems to me that somehow in doing that, we may miss the boat. I know my engagement in this project has made me see very clearly how important it is to hear the voices, to hear the writing, to hear their voices very clearly.

It seems to me that one thing that we've missed in curriculum transformation projects is how important writing is to this process. It seems to me that, with the popularity of black women writers of the sort that Biman mentioned, these writers easily can be incorporated into courses about black women, into courses about writing. But often what we forget is the writing of those students who come out of that experience; that, in drawing from Professor Royster's language, what we forget is moving those silences into writing. What we forget is the polyvalent . . . concerns of these students. What we forget is that the young African-American women, in the case of our project, are witnesses and their writings serve as a witness to that experience. It seems to me that in our curriculum transformation efforts, we have sometimes not been attuned to writing in the curriculum and transforming the curriculum in this respect. What we're talking about is no less than reconstructing the University and that's never very easy. It seems to me that in multiple layers, from teaching to faculty development to course transformation to writing, all of this will have to be done. I think I was, in short, pressed on by some of the comments that Professor Royster made. She attuned us to the multiple considerations of creating a curriculum for all those who have been marginalized. That is the key question and that is the key issue.

A response to the keynote
by Dolores Cross

My response is a response *from* the margins. It's a passage that was written by me some fourteen years ago when I was a thirty-eight-year-old associate professor at Claremont Graduate School. I was prompted to share this particular passage because of some of the comments that Jackie Royster made last night. I refer you to the passage in which she shared with us these sentences: "Students need to understand their intellectual ancestry. They need to understand power and how they are affected by it. I believe that students are in a much stronger position to fashion for themselves their own authority to speak, to write, and to produce if they know their own history."

I share with you something that I wrote as an Associate Professor coming to grips with being on the margins, coming to grips with my own blackness and my relatedness to myself, my history and to that of my mother. When Lillian mentioned this conference to me, I told her that I, too, write. I have written notes to myself over a period of years. It started for me when I was very young because, as I've shared with some people here, I had difficulty speaking for a long time growing up. Until about the age of twelve or thirteen, I stuttered. It was very, very painful so I had to write notes to myself. At the time, my son was about ready to graduate from high school and I put together a collection of notes to myself. One of these notes was titled "Smoothing Wrinkles—Faces From the Past." They are the thoughts of a woman who was marginalized and continues to be marginalized.

> In every move from Newark to New York to Ann Arbor for the Ph.D. and now to Claremont, always asking myself: Will it do that there are flowers, trees, mountains, soft grass, flowering bushes? Can I absorb it all and somehow in new places grow and be able to look back and understand why from this cultivated, maturing, caring and compassionate pasture, there are departures in deep brooding and recurring anger and displeasure that my mother is my mother?
>
> Awareness of this incongruence within my person enlightens, but does not in itself excuse or obliterate the dilemma. I can recall within each previous place while championing new hurdles and saying, "I am growing" and being annoyed when someone would say, "You look like your mother." What is it? It would make me feel uncomfortable. But I heard them saying more. Perhaps like her, I would not be taken seriously. The role was cast. Like her, your full lips would be perceived as you were always pouting. And the pout might interfere or obstruct from some external beauty. And like her, you would always be viewed as a child.
>
> I didn't want to look like her and inherit the centuries and constraints of stereotypes perceived by others in my mother. And now some smoothing of wrinkled spaces in the past as I draw and ponder the analogy that my mother is my blackness.
>
> There are evenings when the only phone call is from my mother as if next door rather than in Newark, New Jersey. And more than ever before, I find myself dealing with me by listening very carefully to what she is saying and sorting the why of my

behavior from what she is saying. I hear her saying that my credentials keep her bragging. "I know you're tired." "I hope you're not going out too much and please don't let people use you." And despite the distance, she says, "I'm glad you're there. The family would just wear you out and you really don't need anyone." "It's pretty out there and are you rested?" "Dolores, you must take care of your health. I worry about you. What would I do if something happened to you?" "I won't tell people where you are because I don't want them to pester you. I know you're busy." "Dolores, you don't owe them anything. Remember, I went to night school for almost 20 years. I took exams. I have my lawyer dealing with my civil service case right now." And she adds how she independently travels—to every place where I seem to live. And when all else fails, she asserts, "Remember, I *am* your mother." As she talks, I visualize her apartment setting, its clutter, and there's always the feeling, as in a newspaper office, that something really is going to take place and is going to take a new shape. There are clothes for herself, her grandchildren, scattered in various stages of completion, old souvenirs, ticket stubs, clippings, letters to lawyers, politicians, to club members, each thrown about in the room. And I know despite this disarray, it all has meaning. There is evidence in the contents of her place of dealing with her sex, age, race, person, and role potential. And it's cluttered. For how could it be ordered? She does not know now the depth or difference of my listening. Am I beginning to soothe the dilemma by seeing that my mother had once been a child with questions, lightness, and dreams like me and had to cope with the time and circumstance she entered history?

I am developing some illuminating wisdom as I better understand the necessity of her linking self to me. My mother is my blackness and in saying that I know I will probably never be seduced to forgetting by the flowers, mountains, soft grass, bushes, and this never, never land. It is important and freeing to be past the young point of acting like I was immaculately conceived and deeply worrying about her as a professional role model.

In reconstructing or recalling, the moments seem to linger, yet cannot be permitted to consume. Each of us selects end goals and has inherited a filter in which to see light. In this case, it's my blackness, to sift a quality of awareness that complements the larger human experience. In this place of my time line, I am more intact than I have ever experienced. I'm intact enough to feel the warmth that springs from deep glances, gestures and indicators of degrees of caring, and, with these supports, focus on a process and product in line with responsibility and knowing. At the same time, I can use the coolness from people lightly in touch to clear my eyes and check undesirable passivity. It is important not to expect, as in the fairy tales, that each kiss could transform whatever circumstance into beguiling lovingness with no ending to happily ever after, and never expect to be grown up to the point of resignation, and always to deal with reality and the depth of knowing that can both hurt and caress my insides.

Thank you.

A response to the keynote by Carol Miller

I, too, am glad to have the opportunity to react to Professor Royster's discussion last night and to try to connect some of its ideas to the work we've been doing on the grant. Carolyn Evans and I are working on a grant funded by the Center, studying through interviews the experiences of students of color in composition classes at the University.

This is a nice segue because one of the ideas I thought was most interesting in Jackie's presentation last night was her notion of getting to the stories behind the stories and trying to find ways to get at the hearts and minds of students to degrees that we haven't done in the past.

That's the work of the interviewing process that Carolyn and I have been able to do this quarter. It has allowed us to ask students not only what their experience is in the composition classrooms that they've been in the University, but also to ask what their perceptions of those experiences are. I think that we're coming to some real understanding of that information that we didn't have before we began. That information from students is critical in the kind of discussion that you began with us, engaged us in last night.

Another thing I was struck by in Jackie's discussion last night was the whole notion of marginality—how we talk about it, how frequently we talk about it, and how it is so frequently applied to the notion of writing's place in the curriculum. I'm usually an optimist, and I'm sure these remarks reflect that, but I think that, although marginality in most academic structures is a current reality, the wind is blowing. The wind is blowing, and we all, I think, are beginning to see that the center is genuinely opening up in some ways.

I am struck by how often, when somebody asks me what I do, I say I teach writing, and they say, "Oh, you're an English teacher. I was never any good at that." But I'm not an English teacher. That's not what I do anymore. I am a writing teacher, among a number of other things, and writing is not marginal in my professional identity. It's not marginal in the work I do or in my place of work in General College. That movement of writing to the center, even in our self-definitions, is a real positive force that is supportive and that stands against despair about other aspects of the profession.

I was thinking also more generally about curriculum and how the notion of what is marginal is changing in the curriculum at large. Which is really a more marginal course: "The Bible as Literature" or "Creative Lives—the Writings of Leslie Silko, Paula Gunn Allen, and Louise Erdrich"? I'm almost sure that I can tell the answer to that question, and that the answer is not the same as when I went to graduate school twenty years ago. That shift of curriculum toward inclusiveness can benefit us all.

I was also struck by Jackie's reference last night to multiple consciousness and how frequently that notion appears in the literature about the experience of students of color in composition. A good

example is in the whole notion of the double bind, where students are seen as having a cultural language that may conflict with "academic" language. It's a mistake to think of multiple consciousness as necessarily a problem to be overcome. Multiple consciousness, it seems to me, should be a wonderful advantage to one's experience of the world. And the history of expression which thinks of that "double bind," of that multiple consciousness, as an impediment to students' success might be turned around. From another construct, multiple consciousness might be a strength that eventually could empower students in ways that we haven't really thought about or tapped yet.

In that notion of questioning the validity of such assumptions about students, we have the real opportunity to change our ideas about how educational transformation is going to occur. It seems to me that the task is not to move people and ideas in from the margins, but to open up the center, to make the center accessible, and, in fact, redefined to include other voices and experiences which have been unregarded before.

Finally, Jackie's comments made me want to think further about other ethnocentric assumptions embedded very deeply and perhaps even subconsciously in much of the current composition discussion. Even when you get beyond the beast that won't die, the discussion of performance expectations and "standards" and the relation of that debate to students of color and underprepared and nontraditional students, there are still a number of other assumptions sometimes put forward by the most interesting and humane thinkers in the profession that begin with the idea that students' cultural identities, are, in some way, a kind of surface feature, like a grammar error, and that the successful student is the one who can be led to rub away that cultural identity. Those notions, I think, show up in the literature pretty pervasively even now. We're wrestling with those ideas as we come to them in our theoretical and practical discussions, but I'm afraid that assumption is undeniably ethnocentric.

Where is the thinking that suggests an educational context and curriculum and pedagogical behaviors that are not monolithic, but involve academic models of transaction among cultures, values, and priorities rather than assimilation to a dominant norm? What may really become possible now and what may really begin to happen is an evolution of more complex thinking about these issues that I think is genuinely hopeful and that is in its base, perhaps, capable of redressing the notions of hierarchy that have caused such trouble for so many learners.

I think that for Carolyn and me the pleasure of our grant has been that it has allowed us to focus on the stories behind the stories as we listened to students talk about their own experience in classes; it's allowed us to open an avenue of expression of some of the genuine observations that I think come from their hearts and minds. And it's begun to let us begin at least to pose these questions in more complex ways, to begin to imagine what the questions might be, if not quite to answer them.

Part 3
Question and Answer Session

After the prepared reponses, the floor was opened to general questions and discussion. The remarks below were taken from a transcript of this forum. (Brackets [ ] identify clarifications by the editor or places where the recording was not audible.)

Robert Danberg

I'm interested in the way pedagogy concerns relationships in the classroom itself, not just the content, the inclusion of other voices. I'm interested in how we as instructors can make the kind of pedagogical tools that also reflect multicultural concerns. Anyone want to comment on this?

Dolores Cross

I'd just like to describe to you something in my teaching at the advent of multiculturalism, which I found very helpful. I would ask my students to write a very brief reaction paper to my lectures, to hear their way of understanding and knowing what I was saying. . . . Then I would send them a reaction back to say what I heard them saying, what I heard from my perspective. It's an exercise which, to my thinking, should occur at some point in the teaching/learning situation.

Lisa Albrecht

I guess when I think about my repertoire in a classroom, I feel that my success comes from different strategies I bring in pedagogically, so that in terms of classroom writing, there's in-class writing, journal writing, more formal essay writing, rough drafts, revising, feedback from me and feedback from peers in the classroom; there are group activities where the students work two, three, or four together on one project, on a project that lasts a week, on a project that might last ten weeks. Multiple strategies are critical because people have different learning styles. I do a mini-lecture

rather than lecturing to a whole class when I teach literature. Some students do learn from lecture, but that's not my whole repertoire. I constantly ask students to *actively* learn.

I also constantly evaluate what I do and ask students to evaluate what they've learned. They talk to each other about it. Then I usually change it the next quarter, mix it around.

Jackie Jones Royster

I'd like to respond from a slightly different perspective in terms of the struggle that I had as a teacher trying to figure out what to do with students that I've taught. And over the years, I think I've come back to something that I started out hating. That is the question of what the philosophy is in a classroom, what it is that you think that you're doing, what it is that you're envisioning the task to be. I think the vision that you have as a teacher, what it is that you're trying to do, really does set in motion some wheels that either allow for certain kinds of possibilities for students or don't. For me, in coming back to re-examine what it was that I was trying to do, I think I've settled on the notion that it is a question of the role of authority. One of the things that's useful from the literature today in talking about these things is the difference between centralized and decentralized authority. If you have an image of a teacher that says you are the authority and you are the one doing everything, taking the responsibility for learning, then how much room does that allow for other voices to be heard, when those voices are coming from a gender base, a racial base, a cultural base, or any other kind of voice? It is a question of who has the authority to speak in the classroom, and under what circumstances, for what reasons. This kind of rethinking about what kind of person I want to be in the classroom allowed me to raise different kinds of questions so I can see the need to talk back to students and to have them talk back to me or to take responsibility for certain kinds of things: to work in small groups or in pairs or to work away from the classroom or to have the freedom to see that there are other things that you can do that don't fit in the traditional patterns of what constitutes a class.

Anne Aronson

Jackie and Lisa also brought up the issue of assessment and evaluation of student work. It seems to me that the issues of assessment are situated institutionally, that it's not just the assessment of student writing. There's also the assessment of faculty and administrators, and that you are raising questions that really challenge the standards and criteria that have traditionally been put forth as ways that we measure performance. I wonder if you have any suggestions. I believe deeply in the flexibility you're talking about, and I wonder if you have any suggestions for what to do. How do

flexibility you're talking about, and I wonder if you have any suggestions for what to do. How do you implement a more flexible evaluation?

Jackie Jones Royster

It seems like to me that one of the first things that we need to do is to start looking at what assessment is a little bit more broadly, and I'm certain that Lilly, and what she's trying to do with this program, could certainly speak to that within your own context. One of the things that I've found most provocative in this last year was a talk by Rexford Brown at the American Association of Higher Education Assessment Conference. He said something that we all know, which made it even more powerful: you don't need a test to tell who's going to pass it. Now he used different words to say that, but that's what he said: you don't need a test to tell who's going to pass it. You know that ahead of time. And if you know that ahead of time, then our definitions of assessment are just too narrow. We're not even defining what assessment is and why it's useful to us. Because if you know that, then there should be something that we could use to get that information out on the table more consciously without destroying what we have right now. One mechanism that I have been trying with the faculty at Spelman is to start using at least the vocabulary—that I got from Jerrie Scott at Central State University in Ohio, as a matter of fact. Well, she had slightly different categories, but I co-opted them. You know we steal from each other. [Laughter, leading to the next comment] But don't let me get too ethnic here. The difference among academics is that typically we call stealing collaboration. Jerrie Scott and I have collaborated on many projects over the years, and I know that I have benefitted from the privilege of being able to share with a colleague. I hope that she has too.

The vocabulary, though, is:

- *Initial assessment*—How do you start a class? What kind of feedback are you getting from students to determine where you begin?
- *Interim assessment*—What kind of conversation do you need to engage in to know that things are going okay? What can you measure that lets you know that students are actually doing what you want them to do or even doing something better than you could even have imagined that needed to be done? And then,
- *Culminating assessment*—talking about ranking and filing in ways that might be more empowering and less constraining.

So those three terms have helped me a lot in thinking or pulling from our subconscious activity, the kinds of things that we can look at that would help to define more liberally what assessment is.

Carol Miller

How do you do this? Assessment is less problematic if students understand realistically what one's expectations are from the beginning. [We need to be more articulate so that they] know that we demand that expectation. Then there's a real context for [the students] in the classroom, with that kind of realistic information right from the beginning. I don't think students are looking for an easy way out. It's not that we have to have some kind of different measures because the implications of that are tremendous. But we do have to have a more careful context and understanding in the classroom, I think, which allow students to genuinely know what performance means and how performance is measured.

Bruce Maylath

One of you, I think it was Rose, said that if you had the opportunity, you'd reconstruct the University, and I'm wondering what that University might look like if you could reconstruct it and say what you're implying by having various courses, various emphases come in. But it appears to me that the University as a whole is a medieval institution and isn't even an institution of the nineteenth century, much less the twenty-first. If you could reconstruct the University in its totality, what would you have it look like?

Rose Brewer

Well just to briefly respond to what you're saying, I don't think I would treat it as timelessly as you're implying because I think we've seen right here at the University of Minnesota how much it is driven by corporate concerns, by late twentieth-century American capitalism, its demand for certain kinds of majors, certain kinds of specializations, so I'm a little less pristine in my assessment of what's going on here than you seem to imply.

I think it's very much a product of this society. And as that society is transformed, so is this institution. But there is a two-way flow there. And to be optimistic and not too cynical, one has to believe that your work here isn't in vain, that something that you're doing is going to have an outward impact. I would use a colloquialism. It's something more than pissing in the ocean. [Loud laughter] I did use it after all!

I think what we're saying is that some of the things that are happening here will dialectically have impact as people go into the broader society, as they engage the broader society with the new visions they've had about learning and being and knowing and that that will reflect back, or double

back on, to the very processes that today, to some extent, drive the University. So I don't see it as something that's automatically attainable in each little school, but, as a matter of fact, is a dialectical process, that we're doing something here that will flow outward and then it will double back in. That would be my short term answer.

Dolores Cross

I may be a little more cynical about it. . . . [Laughter]

Lillian Bridwell-Bowles

We don't want *you* [as Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs] to be cynical about it. [Laughter]

Dolores Cross

It's so different, so refreshing, what we were talking about. And then I have to put on my other hat, in terms of what I see and how people plan, the plans they project. When many people in this university think about diversity, what diversity means, they think about it just the way that people look different, and how there's some sort of proximity to people who look different. They're really not talking about changing the teaching/learning process. They're not talking about departments and faculty looking at what is presented as knowledge. They're not looking at whether or not there is a respect and appreciation for diversity, in terms of what students write and what they want to use as their resources. I'm wondering how students are involved in a critical analysis of issues that have impact on our multicultural society. Some of the plans that I see about diversity have talked about armies of different colored faces marching. . . . And they think we're going to get these armies of people from somewhere marching to the University, and then the University might think it's achieved diversity, but it will not have scratched the surface of the teaching/learning problem if the research, the writing, and the products are expected to conform to a traditional and unicultural perspective. So that in terms of an answer to your question about what the University would look like, it means different things to different people. But to my thinking, diversity implies an acceptance, celebration, and indeed a cultivation of different perspectives.

Bruce Maylath

If I can be more specific then. I'm thinking particularly of the University hierarchy and how power is distributed in that hierarchy. To use my medieval metaphor, you've got undergraduate serfs, you've got graduate student squires, assistant professor knights and you can go right on up through the baronies and duchies and so forth at the various stages of the feudal hierarchy around here. Is reconstructing the University just bringing out Dolores Cross as Vice President and Associate Provost? Is it just substituting new persons in those positions or is it really reconstructing the whole hierarchy so there's not a hierarchy, but some sort of matrix or network? What do you see in those terms?

Jackie Jones Royster

I have a couple of responses to that because I think what I hear in your question is a respect for the need to understand how power operates at the University and how we have, as I talked about earlier today, assumed roles in the hierarchy, how that process operates in our lives in all kinds of ways, in certain obvious ways, in the way universities are structured and departments are structured, or other kinds of games that we play in education and our instruction. But for me, I'd like to be an optimist when I talk about that kind of question because if we talk about the big picture too much, we get closed down and start seeing so much of the complexity that we are kind of befuddled and left at sea. I keep being reminded of the poster from the Children's Defense Fund: "The ocean is so big and my boat is so small." You feel like you are really going against impossible odds. However, being the ultimate optimist that I think I am, I see that change can begin in a lot of different ways. The way to create that world that you're talking about really does begin in individual classrooms where you have the authority to build your university right there with anyone in your classes. The trick is to share those conversations in structured ways, so that there is a kind of dialectical experience reverberating throughout the University. At the same time, we should be changing our hiring policies and admissions policies and other kinds of things, so that what you get, even though it looks very medieval in outward structure, when you get inside, it feels very different. There are different kinds of things going on. I'm not one of those people who believes you have to throw everything out. I think that there can be something that we can salvage from the medieval model *if* there is good thinking going on. I think that if you allow creativity to happen—and I didn't really get into it last night—in individual ways, and then we structure specific opportunities for those individuals to get together and empower each other, and question each other and keep the inquiry open in structured ways, then

we have a chance. We really do have a chance to change power relationships. The very fact that Dolores Cross holds the position that she does on this campus says that the University of Minnesota is a different place because she's there saying things that were not said before she got there.

Dolores Cross

I just want to add something to that, . . . I think the difficulty that each of us faces is how to move minority programs as well as the ideas from diversity from the edge to the center. For the past 20 or 30 years minority programs have survived on the edge. The trick is how do we get into the center, how do we get into the mainstream in academic affairs? That's the question I heard in Jackie's speech last night.

Robert Danberg

[Because of noise on the tape, Robert Danberg's question could not be transcribed verbatim. What follows is a paraphrase of his question.]

How do we put students who have been tagged by the University as marginalized at the center of the classroom so they can tell their stories and be heard by others? Secondly, what about marginalized students who have repressed their own stories—how do we get them to recognize their stories and make a space for them in the classroom?

Jackie Jones Royster

I think part of the problem that I often hear in situations like this when we're talking about what happens to marginalized students is that they are treated as the only people who need to engage in these kinds of conversations. You see, the problem that I have, I think, can be illustrated by an experience that was shared by a woman who taught at Smith College, a place that has very privileged people. In a discussion about socio-economic class, almost everyone in her course named themselves "middle-class people." You know, they didn't want to own who they really were and what that means, and how that can be, I keep using my term, "otherized." You don't get to sit in the center. Nobody's sitting in the center today. We're all going to be on the edge. We need to acknowledge ways in which we can make ourselves other, so that we can have a more inclusive conversation about the people who are put on the edge and in the center more often than others. I talked a few minutes ago about how I voluntarily these days, because of the things I care about, I'm always

marginalizing myself! And I like it like that! Those are good things to talk about. Good things to think about. I'm empowered by that experience. Other people might be, too, if you give them a chance. And even if they're not, we might have a better kind of conversation just by the activity. So part of the problem, I think, is in saying, "Well, we need to do something with these marginalized students." It's not seeing that other people we think of as not being marginalized are party to this situation as well. We're talking about teaching and learning here. We're not talking about just what happens with the people who have been denied access in more systematic ways. We need to rethink the whole way that we are defining the problem and seeking solutions and implementing change.

Rose Brewer

I think the crux of it is that you can't even have a conversation without engaging those who consider themselves at the center. Their very existence is part and parcel of what we call the marginalized. I think that it's not so much an either/or, it's that the bulk at the end of it is that, for an example, to talk about racism in class, we presume that only black people have a race, [which is what some white people do]. It's exactly what she's talking about. You can't even understand racial dynamics within this country without understanding there was a black/white people color dynamic. So in a sense, I'm just adding a thought to what she was saying, that you really can't talk about one without the other. You can't really act upon one—even though administrators, even though faculty, even though people themselves sometimes do not recognize that reality. And I think part of our exercise is having authority. And we do have authority in the classroom. This is the kind of thing that you raised, making that very visible.

Lisa Albrecht

I would just add, when I think of students who challenge me, I think of the young, white male who rollerbladed into my freshman composition class, proudly announcing his Young Republican stand on human relations. He said, "I'm tired of talking about racism and sexism." What a challenge for me! Somehow, in talking about who he was, we started to talk about his class background. Suddenly, he spoke of his history, of where he came from. He did not come from money. Suddenly he located a piece of his identity. It helped him understand his own race and gender. Then we sat and talked about how I could be a teacher and he could be my student and we could have different opinions and attitudes and values, but we could come to understand ourselves through this lens of gender, race, and class. We agreed we could respect each other and work together. And we did successfully.

Jackie Jones Royster

And you don't know a lot until you allow people to respond. Two words that we haven't used today that I think are also important to this conversation are the notions of what privilege means and what entitlement is. What are you entitled to? What do you think you're entitled to? Where does that come from? Having these multiple conversations doesn't mean that there isn't power and domination and inequality in this world, though I think sometimes we have a tendency to lapse into acting as if these oppressions don't actually exist, or don't actually matter, and of course they do matter—very much.

Robert Danberg

[Again, because of noise on the tape, the first part of Robert Danberg's question could not be transcribed verbatim. He begins his question by stating that often in composition classes that consist of mostly white students, those students believe "the world began the day they were born" and "that class is an issue of language" to enter into the university. The rest of his question follows.]

The controversy that often comes up is the desire to present them with: Here look, look at this, there's this and this and this and it's all different than you, respect this, understand this, take on this new way of thinking about this. How do you deal with the tension of the desire to have them be different in some way and also maintain a dialogue that's open-ended, that allows for the fact that they're not going to make some kind of conversion over the next ten weeks?

Carol Miller

You kept the question too limited. I think you have to ask more difficult questions about the value of conversion. What are you asking them to convert to? Are you asking them to convert to something that's useful to him or not? Is it equally useful to everyone in the class? Why are Asian students performing better than [Palestinian], blacks or [African American]? Why do [immigrant] populations perform better than [nonimmigrant] populations? Because you're being asked to make a change that has a different value to it. So I think there's something. There are even questions that you have to ask before that, not how do you get them to do it, but what are you doing when you ask them to do it? What are the outcomes? There are many questions around the . . . we're at the

beginning of this discussion that is hugely interesting and hugely complicated. It's not a matter of what you do, there's a lot more to be asked in that whole context (and it's a challenge).

Lillian Bridwell-Bowles

I am going to have to say that this is going to be the last question. . . .

Riv-Ellen Prell

I don't want to ask a question. I want to make a comment, it goes back to what you said before and that is about noncentralized learning, and that is you have this question that: How do you get your students to see that you're not the only one in the classroom? Last quarter when I was teaching my course for the grant, I had students reading a cultural criticism text about blue jeans, trying to argue that there are many, many reasons people wore blue jeans, and a great many people in the class contended that people wore blue jeans just because they were blue jeans, and this woman said only in the 60s did people wear symbols . . . [laughter], she said this contemptuously. . . . And about a quarter of the class was very eloquently arguing for why it was important to think about wearing blue jeans and what they understood about themselves and their culture as a result of wearing that kind of clothing. . . . It was a wonderful class because they were alive and learning . . . and the person who thought people only wore blue jeans because they were blue jeans turned out to represent a minority of the class, but by no means the majority. I didn't have to make that point; the students made it to each other.

Jackie Jones Royster

It seems like to me if we can hold back our need to fill up the silence when it's quiet and allow the students to talk, that things like that are possible. But I also think that if we can hold back the complexity of problems sometimes and focus on the little things, there are also opportunities. Because what I found in difficult situations like the one you're talking about, say for example, I've worked with small groups of very privileged white students and tried to get them to accept other worlds, and one of the things that I have had to recognize is that the thing that's important to me is to keep the talk going, so if that means they need time out to just be the little nasty people that they are, [laughter] then that's okay because they won't be that for long. You give them a little break and then you say, okay, we're off again. It's just a little time out. I'm exaggerating, they're just normal students and they're very much egocentric still like most of your own kids. You just have to give them time to

take a breath. But the thing is to keep the conversation going. So no, you may not be able to talk about all these other worlds all the time. You have to play with that a little.

Lillian Bridwell-Bowles

I want to keep the conversation going during a reception for you which will follow here in this room. Secondly, if you came in late and you didn't hear that all of you are invited to a potluck at my house, please talk to me. The third thing is that we will be putting together a monograph based on some of the things that are coming out of this conference. We'll be putting together Jackie's paper, responses to Jackie's paper, and we'll be putting together your voices as we can hear them on the tape recorder. Also we'd like to invite anyone who didn't say anything to send us a note or a comment, a written reaction. If you would not mind if we put it in the monograph, please indicate that you give us permission to publish what you have to say. So these are all the ways of continuing the conversation that I can think of, and I would be happy for any other suggestions. I promise that there will be no parades through my house tonight [a reference to distracting noises outside]. If you were with us last night, there will be no gooney birds performing at my house tonight [a reference to a band that played outside the building where the keynote address was given]. With a collective of people, Jackie edits *Sage*, a scholarly journal on black women, and some people have asked about that. She will send us some subscription forms to that journal if you're interested in subscribing. Tomorrow, we have on the agenda all the people who had grants from the center this year, and they'll be talking about their work in progress. Several of the people you have heard from today, Biman and Rose and Carol, will be talking about their work along with 13 other people who had projects this year. If you're interested in finding out more about those projects, please come. If you're interested in applying for a grant yourself, please come. Thank you for being here today.

Bibliography

This selected bibliography includes references suggested by the conference participants, as well as texts referenced during the conference.

Annas, Pamela. "Style as Politics: A Feminist Approach to the Teaching of Writing." *College English* 47 (April 1985): 360-371.

Banks, James A. *Education in the 80's: Multiethnic Eduation.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1981.

———. *Multiethnic Education: Theory and Practice.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1981.

Banks, James A. and Cherry A. McGee Banks, eds. *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1981.

Carby, Hazel. *Reconstructing Womanhood: The Emergence of the Afro-American Novelist.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Chodorow, Nancy. *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Christian, Barbara. *Black Feminist Criticism: Perspectives on Black Women Writers.* New York: Pergamon Press, 1985.

———. *Black Women Novelists: The Development of a Tradition, 1892-1976.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1980.

Collins, Patricia Hill and Margaret L. Anderson, eds. *An Inclusive Curriculum: Race, Class, and Gender in Sociological Instruction.* Washington D.C.: American Sociological Association, 1987.

Cooper, Anna Julia. *A Voice from the South.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Cummins, Jim. "Empowering Minority Students: A Framework for Invention." *Harvard Educational Review* 56 (February 1986): 18-36.

David, Deidre. *Intellectual Women and Victorian Patriarchy: Harriet Martineau, Elizabeth Barret Browning, George Eliot.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987.

DuBois, W.E.B. *Souls of Black Folk.* New York: New American Library, 1969.

Evergreen Chronicles: A Journal of Gay and Lesbian Literature, P.O. Box 8939, Minneapolis, MN 55408.

Farrell, Thomas J. "The Female and Male Models of Rhetoric." *College English*. 40 (April 1979): 909-921.

Feagans, Lynne and Dale Clark Farran, eds. *The Language of Children Reared in Poverty*. New York: Academic Press, 1982.

Flynn, Elizabeth A. "Composing as a Woman." *College Composition and Communication* 39 (December 1988): 423-435.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum Publishing Co., 1988.

Gendlin, Eugene. *Focusing*. New York: Everest House, 1978.

Grant, Carl A. and Christine E. Sleeter. "Race, Class, and Gender in Education Research: An Argument for Integrative Analysis." *Review of Educational Research* 56 (Summer 1986): 195-211.

Green, Madeleine F., ed. *Minorities on Campus: A Handbook for Enhancing Diversity*. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1989.

Hall, Roberta and Bernice Sandler. *The Classroom Climate: A Chilly One for Women?* Washington D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1982.

Henderson, Mae. "Speaking in Tongues." *Changing Our Own Words: Essays on Criticism, Theory, and Writing by Black Women*. Ed. Cheryl A. Wall. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1989.

Heilbrun, Carolyn G. *Reinventing Womanhood*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1979.

hooks, bell. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Boston: South End Press, 1984.

Keroes, Jo. "But What do They Say? Gender and the Content of Student Writing." Paper presented at 4C's 37th annual conference in New Orleans, March 13-15, 1986. ERIC, 1986. ED 269 802.

Kochman, Thomas. *Black and White Styles in Conflict*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Lamb, Catherine E. "Female and Male Models of Rhetoric in an Advanced Composition Course." Paper presented at 4C's 32nd annual conference in Dallas, March 26-28, 1981. ERIC, 1981. ED 203 346.

Levine, George, et. al. *Speaking for the Humanities*. New York: American Council of Learned Societies, 1989.

Naylor, Gloria. *Linden Hills*. New York: Viking Penguin, Inc., 1985.

Norton, Robert F. "A Comparison of Thinking and Writing Patterns in Korea and the United States." *AFS Occasional Papers in Intercultural Learning*. ED 290 648.

O'Brien, Mary. "The Commatization of Women: Patriarchal Fetishism in the Sociology of Education." *Interchange* 15 (1984): 43-60.

Pearson, Carol S., Donna L. Shavlik, and Judith G. Touchton, eds. *Educating the Majority: Women Challenge Tradition in Higher Education*. New York: American Council on Education/ Macmillan Publishing Company, 1989.

Perl, Sondra. "Understanding Composing." *College Composition and Communication* (December 1980): 363-369.

Pryse, Marjorie and Hortense Spillers. *Conjuring*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Purves, Alan C. and William C. Purves. "Viewpoints: Cultures, Text Models, and the Activity of Writing." *Research in the Teaching of English* 20 (May 1986): 174-197.

Royster, Jacqueline Jones. *When Diversity Counts: The Teaching of Writing at UNCF Colleges and Universities*. The United Negro College Fund.

Sage: A Scholarly Journal on Black Women. 1 (Spring 1984).

Sargent, Lydia, ed. *Woman and Revolution*. Boston: South End Press, 1981.

Smith, Barbara. *Homegirls.: A Black Feminist Anthology*. New York: Kitchen Table; Women of Color Press, 1983.

———. "Toward a Black Feminist Criticism." *Conditions Two*. 1 (October 1977): 25-44.

Smitherman, Geneva. *Talkin' and Testifyin': The Language of Black America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1977.

Solomon, Barbara Miller. *In the Company of Educated Women: A History of Women in Higher Education*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Thurman, Howard. "The Sound of the Genuine." Founders' Day Address, Spelman College, Atlanta: April 11, 1981.

Walker, Alice. *Meridian*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1977.

Weis, Lois, ed. *Class, Race, & Gender in American Education*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988.